IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.2894 OF 2005

Mrs. Sayed Sajjad Rehana ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State Trading Corp. of India Ltd. and Ors. ...Respondents

Mr Sundeep Pasbola for the Petitioner.

CORAM : A.M. KHANWILKAR, J.
DATE : DECEMBER 02, 2005.

P.C.:

1. Alternative efficacious remedy is available to the Petitioner by way of revision in view of the decision of this Court in the case of V.K.Jain & Ors. Vs. Pratap V. Padode reported in 2005(3) Mh.L.J. 778, no interference is warranted. It will be open to the Petitioner to take recourse to remedy of revision, if so advised.

2. At this stage, Mr. Pasbola submits that some protection may be granted to the Petitioner as the matter before the Trial Court is to be heard tomorrow. Counsel for the Respondent points out that the Petitioner has sought adjournment on more than one occasion and infact the Trial Court was required to impose costs for the conduct of the Petitioner. It is submitted by the Counsel for the Respondent that the attitude of the Petitioner is to only protract the

proceeding.

3. In this view of the matter, no orders are passed on the request made. The Petitioner to persuade the Revisional Court in that behalf.

4. The Revisional Court will decide the proceedings on its own merits uninfluenced by any observations made in this order.

A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.